

THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 2006

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Minutes of the Regular Session of the County Planning Commission held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, CA, at 8:45 a.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Bob Roos, Bruce Gibson, Penny Rappa, and Chairman Mehlschau

ABSENT: Commissioner Sarah Christie

The meeting is called to order by Chairman Mehlschau.

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Planning Commission and as listed on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of March 23, 2006, together with the maps and staff reports attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG IS LED BY CHAIRMAN MEHLSCHAU.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Eric Greening: Recommends amending agenda to include discussion regarding Counsel of Governments to discuss reasoning for cost and rate of performance for highway projects. Discusses cost increases in materials, transportation projects, Willow Road interchange, SLOCOG, and process explanation made by Counsel of Governments and Public Works. Discusses Negative Declarations coming across for projects especially around the Nipomo Mesa.

PLANNING STAFF UPDATES

Victor Holanda, Director, Planning and Building: Makes statement relative to Grand Jury Report released today and will defer to Kami Griffin for any staff updates. States that since the grand jury report is not on the agenda today it would be inappropriate to have any open discussions relative to that matter. States the Planning Department is required to respond to both the grand jury report and to the Board of Supervisors. States he will be speaking with the Planning Commissioners in an open session or study session relative to relevant points of the Grand Jury report to help in drafting a response to the Grand Jury. States this is a time sensitive issue as there is a due date on the response time to get back to the grand jury.

Commissioner Gibson: Questions nature of investigation.

Victor Holanda, Director Planning and Building: Cannot answer as he is admonished from speaking about the investigation.

Commissioner Gibson: Requests clarification on whether there will be open discussion of the Planning Department's response as it is discussed with the Planning Commission.

Victor Holanda, Director Planning and Building: States he will be having discussions with the Planning Commissioners regarding which parts of the report they are concerned about -or in disagreement with, in preparing for a response to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses being bound through secrecy regarding any disclosures of reporting to the Grand Jury.

Commissioner Gibson: States he feels there were casual allegations made without substantiations, pointing out what he feels to be a factual error made on Page one of the report. Discusses how the facts were considered when the Grand Jury put the report together.

Chairman Mehlschau: Requests clarification from the director on whether this will become a future agendized item with Mr. Holanda answering that it will.

Kami Griffin, staff: Discusses scheduling time for study sessions to discuss this topic in the future.

Commissioner Roos: Notes his reasoning for having to intermittently stand throughout the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. September 22, 2005 Planning Commission minutes
- b. September 29, 2005 Planning Commission minutes
- c. October 13, 2005 Planning Commission minutes
- d. October 26, 2005 Planning Commission minutes
- e. GENERAL PLAN CONFORMITY REPORTS – the Planning Director has issued the following General Plan conformity reports. This is a notice of completed conformity reports to the Planning Commission as required by Section B, Chapter 7 of Framework for Planning, Part 1 of the county Land Use Element, and is being provided for public information only. No action need be taken by the Planning Commission except to **Receive and File** the reports. The decision to issue a General Plan conformity report is solely at the discretion of the Planning Director, although appeals of the Planning Director's determination may be made in accordance with the provisions of the Land Use Ordinance.
(Recommend Receive and File)
 1. Notice of determination of conformity with the General Plan for the abandonment of two existing offers of dedication located at the South end of Quicksilver Way in the Community of Templeton. **Juan Lopez / County File Number: SUB2004-00274.** Lenard F. Mansell, Project Manager.
 2. Notice of determination of conformity with the General Plan for the abandonment of a portion of Avila Beach Drive right of way next to the golf course on the North side of the road across from Cave Landing Road. Also included is the acquisition of additional ROW for the Bob Jones Bikeway. **Rossi Living Trust / SUB2005-00006.** Lenard F. Mansell, Project Manager.
- f. EMERGENCY PERMITS - The following emergency permits have been issued by the Planning Director. This is a report to the Planning Commission as required by Section 22.62.080.b(8) and is being provided for public information only. No action need be taken by the Planning Commission except to **Receive and File**. The decision to issue an emergency permit is solely at the discretion of the Planning Director, although subsequent permits required for the project are subject to all applicable hearing requirements as specified in Titles 22 or 23.

1. **ZON2005-00617 – Shannon Bennett** - Emergency Erosion Control and Monitoring Measures to Protect 5,000 Cubic Yards of Fill. Project is located at 12455 Chia Lane, approximately one-half mile south of the City of Atascadero, in the Salinas River Planning Area. The nature of the emergency involves ensuring protection of the Salinas River from potential erosion and sedimentation that could be caused by sudden or unexpected storm events and inclement weather. Emergency permit issued March 6, 2006.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses Item E.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses Item F. Questions enforcement action regarding removal of dirt.

Kami Griffin, staff: States there is enforcement action at the current time.

Commissioner Mehlschau: Discusses Item E. 2, regarding the abandonment of the bike trail and questions where the new trail will be.

John Hoffschroer, staff: Defers to Jan Del Leo from the Parks Department or Tim Smith from Public Works to clarify.

Jan De Leo, Parks and Recreation Department: Discusses trail abandonment and indicates lines on map. States there will be a good trail.

Commissioner Rappa: Discusses her pleasure at using the trail.

Thereafter on motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Gibson and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Roos, and Gibson

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Christie

ABSTAIN: Chairman Mehlschau and Rappa due to not having been present at previous meetings where items were discussed.

The commission approves Consent Agenda Items A through F.-1 as recommended by the Planning Department.

1. This being the time set for hearing to consider a proposal by **DAVID SCHEEFF** for a reconsideration of a reconsideration of the conditions of approval for Tract 1694 to amend the amount of site disturbance from 10,000 square feet to approximately 60,000 square feet of a seven acre parcel within the approved building envelope on Lot 6 to allow the construction of a single family residence and garage. The project is located on the east side of Earhart Road, via a private easement, approximately 2,000 feet northwest of Old Oak Park Road, north of the City of Arroyo Grande, in the San Luis Bay (Inland) Planning Area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Environmental Document prepared for the item. The Environmental Coordinator, after completion of the initial study, finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not necessary. Therefore, a Negative Declaration (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) has been issued on March 2, 2006 for this project. Mitigation measures are proposed to address Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Public Services and Utilities and Wastewater and are included as conditions of approval. Anyone interested in commenting or receiving a copy of the proposed Environmental Determination

should submit a written statement. Comments will be accepted up until completion of the public hearing(s). **County File No: SUB2004-00155 / TR 1694.** Assessor Parcel Number: 044-562-006. Supervisorial District: 4. Date Accepted: January 11, 2006.

Stephanie Fuhs, staff: Presents staff report.

Commissioner Gibson: Confirms changes are only in number.

Stephanie Fuhs, staff: States clarification for Commissioner Gibson using site map.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses site disturbance disparities in negative declaration.

Kami Griffin, staff: States this will be changed to 60,000.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses rain water runoff threshold.

Thereafter on motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and carried, on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners, Roos, Rappa, Gibson, and Chairman Mehlschau

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Christie

the commission adopts the Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and RESOLUTION NO. 2006-018, granting DAVID SCHEEF a reconsideration of a reconsideration amending the amount of site disturbance as indicated above.

2. This being the time set for hearing to consider a request by **WOODLANDS VENTURES LLC** for a Conditional Use Permit to allow Development of Phase 1B of the Woodlands Village, which includes: 369 residences; a nine-hole golf course; three neighborhood parks; mass grading and infrastructure for an 11 acre public park and future resort site. The proposed project is within the Recreation land use category and is located in the easterly end of the Woodlands Village between Camino Caballo and Mesa Road with Viva Way being the easterly boundary, approximately 2 miles west of the community of Nipomo. The site is in the South County (Inland) planning area. **County File No. DRC2004-00261.** Assessor Parcel No's: 091-221-001 and 091-261-025. Supervisorial District: 4. Date Accepted: January 12, 2006.

Jay Johnson, staff: Presents staff report. Discusses added conditions. Gives corrections for conditions, 2 and 23.

Chairman Mehlschau: Discusses concerns with Camino Caballo regarding being an collector street.

Jay Johnson, staff: Discusses collector standards regarding width of Camino Caballo.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses nature of phrasing of conditions regarding words such as "shall". Discusses addendum reasoning with staff and requests clarification on whether we are relying on the addendum and would like a copy of it. Discusses findings, which rely on previous E.I.R.

Jay Johnson, staff: Clarifies addendum regarding specific plan and subdivision approval.

Allison Donnatello, RRM: Discusses historical work on project and introduces her project team.

Ken Bornhold: Provides commission with page recommending changes to findings and conditions.

Commissioner Gibson: Suggests proceeding through the conditions of project and discusses DP2 being consistent with Condition 6, DP4 location of sound walls reasoning, and Condition 12. Discusses conditions 16, 17, 18 maintenance of improvements being connected with Condition 30, 47, Requests clarification from County Counsel regarding whether the stock condition for a Homeowners Association would be applicable in this case.

Kami Griffin, staff: Clarifies condition 6 referencing DP2.

Jay Johnson, staff: Clarifies sound walls' location reasoning,

Commissioner Rappa: Discusses mass grading, and requests clarification on whether there will be further review of project.

Jay Johnson, staff: Clarifies that upon approval of this project all review is complete. States the subdivision has already been approved.

Jim Orton, County Counsel: Clarifies for Commissioner Gibson the Home Owners Association addition to conditions would only be included for a subdivision approval.

Jan De Leo, Parks and Recreation: Discusses amenity plan and states this did not go to the Park & Recreation committee. However, for Phase 1B of this project it can go. Discusses trail improvements and has Public Works satisfaction .

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses clarity in written conditions. Would like coordination with Public Works and discusses signage wording.

Jim Orton, County Counsel: Discusses approval and requirements of an amenity plan.

Richard Marshall, Public Works, and Jay Johnson, staff: Clarifies for Commissioners the coordinated agency effort approvals and discusses the Planning Department's responsibilities in the initiation of this coordination.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses condition 44 and uses it as an example of clarity of language as compared to other documents with staff responding that they can change the words "should" to "shall". Condition 72 discussed and there is consensus on the word "avoid".

Kami Griffin, staff: Provides some proposed language for Condition 72 such as: "minimizing to the maximum feasible...."

Commissioner Rappa: Discusses identification clarification regarding the environmental document impacts.

Commissioner Roos: Requests clarification on the 11 acre parcel.

Jay Johnson, staff: Clarifies an original agreement between the school district stating the 11 acres will become a park. Provides history of school district and parks department's decision on the 11-acre parcel.

Jan De Leo, Parks and Recreation: States they are working with the Lucia Mar school District regarding the disposition of the 11-acre site.

Thereafter on motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and carried on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Roos, Rappa, Gibson, and Chairman Mehlschau

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Christie

The commission grants Conditional Use Permit DRC2004-00261 to WOODLANDS VENTURES LLC and RESOLUTION 2006-019, based on the Findings in Exhibit A, amending Finding A to add the language; "Supplemental EIR and Addendum"; and subject to the Conditions in Exhibit B, amending Condition 2 to delete the number 369 and replace it with "368"; amending Condition 12 to add the language; "consistent with the Woodlands Specific Plan" and "but is not limited to,".

3. This being the time set for hearing to consider a proposal by the **COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO** to adopt planning area standards that would require applications for general plan amendments and land divisions in the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area to document no net increase in non-agricultural water use or provide supplemental water or pay a supplemental water development fee. Other proposed amendments would broaden the application of low water use landscape requirements and would require the inclusion of specific indoor and outdoor water conservation measures in all new construction. The proposal includes recommendations to amend the Land Use Ordinance, Title 22, the South County Area Plan and the Building and Construction Ordinance, Title 19. The Environmental Coordinator finds that this project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption (Class 7) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15307 because the actions proposed will assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of a natural resource where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment. The Environmental Coordinator finds that the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) is adequate for the purposes of compliance with CEQA because no substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revision of the previously certified FEIR, no substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstance under which the project is undertaken which will require major revision of the previously certified FEIR, and no new information of substantial importance has been identified which was not known at the time that the previous FEIR was certified. County File Number: LRP2005-00006. Date accepted: Not applicable. Supervisorial District No.4

John Hand, staff: Presents staff report. Presents project history from 2004 to present. Discusses AB1600 process for establishment of fees, resulting changes to title 19, and developments subject to the fee. Provides the Planning Commissioners with change to water conservation measure on Pg. 3-13 item d. and, item 2. States turf area limitation will be included.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses prior projects meeting intent of these requirements, and requests clarification on turf area limitations with staff responding to percentages of size of areas.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses title 19.

Chairman Mehlschau: Discusses fee charges relative to what the money would be used for, and who will be charged the fee.

John Hand, staff: Clarifies fee charges and possible uses for such, and disparities in property owners who would be charged.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses disparity in developments, residential rural land having agricultural uses, and water usage.

John Hand, staff: Clarifies water is always referred to as "non agricultural" water demand.

Commissioners and staff: Discuss water uses, amounts of uses and language regarding water entitlements.

Commissioner Rappa: Discusses water conservation and wants an update on gray water or reclaimed water usage and its allow ability. Would like clarification on "non endorsed" use of gray water systems.

Kami Griffin, staff: Clarifies for Commission Rappa the provisions by the Uniform Plumbing Code's use of gray water being at the discretion of the property owner. States this is not endorsed, but is allowed by the county.

John Hand, staff: Discusses suggested implementations for non potable water in general plan, and references locations of such. General plan amendments and water demands discussed.

Commissioner Gibson: Discusses Page 3-7, paragraph 1 "General Plan Amendments and Land Divisions". Requests clarification on the difference between land division and land developments fees. Discusses re-combining those until the fee structure is in place.

Michael Winn, NCSD Vice President: Would like 2004 commitment re-affirmed. Suggests language changes on pages 3-13, 3-10, and 3-8 regarding supplemental water language inclusion.

Commissioner Gibson: Requests opinion from NCSD on including land divisions requiring supplemental water being established.

Michael Winn, NCSD Vice President: Provides opinion and possible fee inclusions. Discusses water area served by NCSD, and annexation of developments therein.

Michael LeBrun: General Manger NCSD. Supports staff's recommendations. Discusses supplemental water, community purveyors, mitigation fee reasoning, gray water, no surface water discharge, purple pipe system economics, and stresses water is being retained.

Commissioner Gibson and Michael LeBrun: Fully discuss property annexation into NCSD, subdivisions, and general plan amendments.

Commissioner Roos: Discusses Board of Supervisors decision and compliance with Board of Supervisors decision.

John Hand, staff: States discussion with Board of Supervisors in May 2005 indicates land divisions will be treated separately.

Commissioner Rappa and staff: Discuss Board of Supervisors decision in 2005 and differences with land divisions and general plan amendment.

Commissioner Gibson: Requests clarification from County Counsel on any recollections he had regarding entitlements at the May 2005 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Tim McNulty, County Counsel: Clarifies he recalls a lack of clarity from the Board of Supervisors in regards to directions of entitlements.

Commissioner Roos: Requests clarification from County Counsel on how to make recommendation on fees being charged for supplemental water.

John Hand, staff: Clarifies interpretation of Board of Supervisors 2005 decision.

Victor Holanda, Director of Planning and Building: Recommends the Planning Commission communicate with the Board of Supervisors to ask for clarification on this point and bring that clarification back to the Planning Commission with their interpretation. States it would be unfair to have staff speculate and interpret on behalf of the policy makers on what they believe they were instructing the Planning Department to do. States if future decisions are made based on Mr. Hand's or his comments made today it could be contrary to what the Board of Supervisors had originally intended.

Commissioner Gibson: Requests clarification from Mr. Holanda on whether he is suggesting a continuance on this item.

Victor Holanda, Director of Planning and Building: Clarifies for Commissioner Gibson that this would be under the Planning Commission's discretion.

Commissioner Rappa: Discusses Planning Commissioners concerns with this being a resource capacity problem and if this is appropriate to bring to the attention of the Board of Supervisors.

Kami Griffin, staff: States the Planning Commission only makes recommendations, if a different recommendation is suggested to be made staff would be directed to do so. States the Planning Commission would modify fee programs applying to existing lots, abandoning them for land divisions, and discusses general plan amendments.

Commissioner Roos: States confusion with Director's suggestion to continuing matter. Discusses turf area and suggests the Planning Commissioners get their direction from the Board of Supervisors.

Victor Holanda, Director of Planning & Building: Disagrees with statement regarding continuing this matter and clarifies that it would be under the Planning Commissioners discretion to continue this matter. Discusses recommendations to, and clarifications from the Board of Supervisors.

Tim McNulty, County Counsel: Discusses presentation by the Planning Commission on recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Suggests the Planning Commission should be recommending language to the Board of Supervisors. Discusses AB1600 fee in regards to extra lots,

Commissioner Rappa: States giving direction to staff to return to Planning Commission is recommended.

Kami Griffin, staff: Projects on screen motion made by the Board of Supervisors in May, 2004 as reference for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation. Projects proposed condition language regarding turf area for the Planning Commission. Percentages of limits discussed. Meeting dates to continue project to discussed.

Tim McNulty, County Counsel: Discusses fees for existing lots of record, and amendment of title.

Commissioners: Discuss coming back with further information this afternoon after the Planning Commission study session

John Hand, staff: Discusses word "shall" as being regulatory language pertaining to programs.

Kami Griffin, staff: Displays language amendments to Title 22

Tim McNulty, County Counsel: Reviews language displayed by staff and concurs with it.

Richard Marshall, Public Works: Discusses Page 3-7 diagram and coastal areas.

Thereafter on motion by Commissioner Gibson, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and carried on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Gibson, Rappa, Roos, and Chairman Mehlschau

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Christie

the commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors approval of amendments as shown in Exhibits A, amending 1. a. to include "and Land Divisions"; deleting 1. b.; Amend 2., adding language: at the end of the sentence; "Only exceptions, as set forth in Subsection 22.16.020.B.2, 4, 6, and 7, are allowed within this area" Add 2. e. and f. to read as follows: e. Drip irrigation. Drip irrigation systems are required for all landscaped areas. The drip irrigation system shall include the following components: automatic rain shut-off device, soil moisture sensors, a separate meter for outdoor water and an operating manual to instruct the building occupant how to use and maintain the water conservation hardware. f. Turf area limits: The maximum amount of turf (lawn) area shall not exceed twenty percent of the site's total landscape area. In all cases, the site's total landscape area shall be limited to 1,500 square feet.; and Exhibit B with the following amended No. 6.: "Supplemental Water Development Fee. The Planning Department, in coordination with the Public Works Department, should determine the amount of a fee to be paid by new development resulting from land divisions or development of existing lots of record that would increase non-agricultural water demand within the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area as soon as possible. Determination of the fee and adoption of an ordinance requiring payment of the fee should be consistent with the requirements of AB 1600., and Exhibit C is amended to add d. (2) into Exhibit A, Title 22, based on the recommended findings.

4. This being the time set for hearing consideration by the Planning Commission of sending a letter to the Board of Supervisors on a possible policy for Responsible Agency handling of Environmental Impact Reports.

John Nall, staff: Introduces Mark Tyson, Planning Department intern who will be controlling the Power Point presentation. Discusses the county's role as "responsible agency", and other different roles such as Responsible Agency, Trustee Agency. Discusses what happens when a responsible agency's E.I.R. is inadequate, and procedures to follow regarding communicating to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS the disposition of E.I.R.

Commissioner Gibson and John Nall, staff: Uses P.G.E. steam generator E.I.R. as an example in requesting clarification regarding the comments made by the Planning

Commission and which of those comments go to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. Letter to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS asking for formal notification of review authority suggested when E.I.R. is completed as a consent agenda level action.

Commissioner Rappa: Requests clarification as whether there was reason why the statute of limitations was not brought to the Planning Commission prior to an expiration date. Is unsure if Commissioner Gibson's approach is correct. Believes timelines/deadlines should be adhered to in order for Planning Commissioners to have enough time to review material.

John Nall, staff, and Commissions: Discuss and clarify the timelines' ineffectiveness regarding lead agencies and responsible agencies because of the inadequacies of time.

Commissioner Gibson: States the 30 day period is insufficient and suggests clear directives on procedures to follow when going forward to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS and suggests a letter be submitted to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS with the extra step of notification.

Chairman Mehlschau: Conveys concern for the letter being submitted within the 30 day requirement.

Victor Holanda, Director, Planning and Building: Suggests that in preparing the letter, one of the environmental coordinator's responsibilities such as looking at different roles, especially as the responsible agency's role be included, thereby as acting environmental coordinator will know in advance that there will be a significant project and then have it agendized before a board agenda, before anyone can act on it.

Eric Greening: Strongly urges the letter be sent to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS as suggested by Commissioner Gibson, and states this item should be agendized. Consultations within the 30-day period with the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS from staff should be made public. Cites Illy Egg Factory as an example of where a responsible agency, the State Water Resources Control Board, successfully overrode decisions of the lead agency, which was the county.

Michael Winn Supports a letter being sent to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS and requests clarification on offered options by staff with the Commissioner Roos responding.

Tim McNulty, Co. Counsel: Discusses standard in the guidelines based on a series of case law advising when a subsequent E.I.R. is required which would have to be when a substantial change to the project or the conditions occurs. Discusses option 4, assuming the lead agency's role as being limited.

Thereafter on motion by Commissioner Gibson, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and carried on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Gibson, Rappa, Roos, and Chairman Mehlschau.

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Christie

the commission approves sending a letter to the Board of Supervisors asking them to review their policies regarding consideration of EIR's when the County is in the role of a Responsible Agency, and asking that they add a step to their procedures whereby their consideration of their options under the situation of finding that EIR inadequate, be explicitly considered and action taken on that on a Board of Supervisors' agenda before the applicable time limits expire.

Thereafter on motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa with Commissioner Christie being absent, motion carries and the Commission receives all documents presented today for the record.

Victor Holanda, Director, Planning and Building: States he has been instructed to respond to the Grand Jury by May 25, 2006 and the Board of Supervisors are to respond to the Grand Jury by June 26, 2006. States that since the Planning Commission is an appointed body of the Board of Supervisors it would be inappropriate for him to have an open discussion agenda item regarding the Planning Department's response to the Grand Jury. Suggests the Planning Commission speak to their appointing authority to express any concerns or questions they may have and in turn the appointing authority can relay that information in their response to the Grand Jury.

Commissioner Gibson: Requests if commissioners are precluded from speaking with staff regarding preparation of response to the Grand Jury.

Victor Holanda, Director, Planning and Building: States he believes they are.

There being no further business to discuss Chairman Mehlschau adjourns this meeting to the next Planning Commission meeting on April 27, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramona Hedges, Secretary Pro Tem
County Planning Commission